UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,402	03/31/2004	Gabor Bajko	39700-796001US/NC40107US	5821

64046   7590   12/23/2009
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER
HO, DUC CHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2465	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 August 2009*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *6,7,9-11,17-19,36,37,39-41,45-47 and 53* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☒ Claim(s) *37 and 39-41* is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *17-19 and 45-47* is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) *6-7, 9-11, 36, 53* is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

Allowable Subject Matter

1.   The indicated allowability of claims 17-19 and 45-47 are withdrawn in view

of the newly discovered reference(s) to Barnes. Rejections based on the newly cited

reference(s) follow.

Claim Objections

2.   Claims 6-7, 9, 11, 36, and 53 are objected to because of the following

informalities: Applicant is requested to amend claims 6-7, 9 as discussed in Oct. 14,

2009 in order to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Claim 6. A method, comprising:

determining, in a first network, an address associated with a called party of a

second network;

determining based on said address if said called party is in a trusted network,

wherein the determining if the called party is in a trusted network comprises checking if

the address is contained in a database of trusted networks provided in at least one

serving call session control function and a security gateway; and

controlling communication between the called party and a calling party of the first

network based on if said called party is in the trusted network, the communication

comprising at least one message for the called party, wherein if the called party is not in

the trusted network, the controlling comprises modifying the at least one message,

wherein controlling is performed by at least one processor.

Claim 7. A method, comprising:

determining, in a first network, an address associated with a called party of a second network;

determining based on said address if said called party is in a trusted network, wherein the determining if the called party is in a trusted network comprises checking if the address is contained in a database of trusted networks, wherein said database comprises domain names associated with the trusted networks and internet protocol addresses of the trusted networks; and

controlling communication between the called party and a calling party of the first network based on if said called party is in the trusted network, the communication comprising at least one message for the called party, wherein if the called party is not in the trusted network the controlling compromises modifying the at least one message, wherein controlling is performed by at least one processor.

Claim 9. A method, comprising:

determining, in a first network, an address associated with a called party of a second network;

determining based on said address if said called party is in a trusted network, wherein said determining, in the first network, the address comprises determining if the address contains a domain name, wherein if a determination is made that the address does not contain the domain name, the determining, in the first network, the address

comprises sending a request for the domain name; and

controlling communication between the called party and a calling party of the first network based on if said called party is in the trusted network, the communication comprising at least one message for the called party, wherein if the called party is not in the trusted network, the controlling comprises modifying the at least one message, wherein controlling is performed by at least one processor.

Claim 11. A method, comprising:

determining, in a first network, an address associated with a called party of a second network;

determining based on said address if said called party is in a trusted network, wherein said determining, in the first network, the address comprises determining if the address contains a domain name, wherein if a determination is made that the address does not contain the domain name, the determining, in the first network, the address comprises assuming that the called party is in an untrusted network; and

controlling communication between the called party and a calling party of the first network based on if said called party is in the trusted network, the communication comprising at least one message for the called party, wherein if the called party is not in the trusted network, the controlling comprises modifying the at least one message, wherein controlling is performed by at least one processor.

Claim 36. An apparatus, comprising:

a first determiner configured to determine an address associated with a called

party located in another network;

a second determiner configured to determine, based on said address, if said

called party is in a trusted network, wherein the second determiner is further configured

to check if the address is contained in a database of trusted networks, wherein the

database is provided in at least one serving call session control function and a security

gateway; and

a controller configured to control communication between the called party and a

calling party, located in a network where the apparatus is located, based on if said

called party is in the trusted network, the communication comprising at least one

message for the called party, wherein if the called party is not in the trusted network, the

at least one message for the called party is modified.

Claim 53. A method comprising:

determining at a serving call session control function in an internet protocol

multimedia subsystem network a trust relation with a called party in another network,

wherein the determining if the called party is in a trusted relationship comprises

checking a database of trusted networks provided in at least one serving call session

control function and a security gateway; and

controlling communication of a message to the called party based on the

determination, wherein if the called party is not trusted the call session control function

removes identity information relating to the calling party from the message, and if the

called party is trusted said identity information is retained.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
>
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
>
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
>
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
>
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior

art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 17-19 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over the admitted prior art in paragraphs 0007-0015 of the instant
application, hereinafter referred to as the APA, in view of Barnes et al. (US6,711,147),
hereinafter referred to as Barnes.

Regarding claim 17, the APA discloses private extensions to SIP that enable a
network of trusted SIP servers to assert the identity of end users or end systems in the
RFC 3325.

According to the APA, there is a need to detect the trustworthiness of the next
hop network. If the next hop is trusted, then the procedures related to the different
privacy options are delegated to the next hop. In other words, the APA suggests a
determining step to find out whether the next hop or the called party in the next hop is
trusted or not, see 0011-0013.

If the next hop network is not trusted in the APA, the privacy procedures need to
be executed by modifying at least one message for the called party.

The Internet Protocol Multimedia (IM) domain supports the Session Initiation
Protocol (SIP). SIP message uses private extensions that enable a network of trusted
SIP servers (in the first network or home network) to assert the identity of end users or
end systems (in the second network). If the caller asks for identity privacy, which is the
case the end users or end systems are not in the trusted network, the home network of
the caller has to remove the header, such that the P- Asserted-Identity field in the
header of a message has to be removed before it reaches the called party, see 0014-
0015.

The APA, however, does not teach a step of determining, in a first network, and
address associated with a called party of a second network.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ a mechanism for finding an address associated with a called party of a second network or the next hop network, and whether the address is in a trusted network, into the system of the APA. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a measure of privacy to protect the user or the caller's identification if the address of the called party is not in the trusted database.

The APA, also does not teach the determining of the called party is in the trusted network comprises determining if a connection from a calling network to a called network is secured.

Barnes discloses merged packet service and mobile Internet protocol. A security gateway, i.e. gateway 264-fig.4, connects a GPRS 250 and a mobile IP network 14, enabling data and calls exchange in security.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ a security gateway as taught by Barnes into the system of the APA. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a measure of privacy in term of a secured connection between parties holding a communication.

Regarding claim 18, in Barnes the determining if the called party is in the trusted network could be performed in the security gateway 264-fig.4.

Regarding claim 19, in Barnes the security gateway 264-fig.4 provides a secure connection, see col.7-line 16 to col. 8-line 9.

Regarding claims 45-47, these claims have similar limitations as claims 17-19. Therefore, they are rejected under the APA-Barnes for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 17-19. The APA includes a first and second determiner.

Allowable subject matter

6.   Claims 37, 39-41 are allowed.

7.   Claims 6-7, 9-11, 36, and 53 would be allowable if amended as set forth in this

Office action.

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Duc Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3147.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to

6:00 pm.

        If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jay Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2988.

        Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(571) 272-2600.

        The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding

is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner

/DUC C HO/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2465

12-19-09